OPINION 117

Type of Lithostrotion

SUMMARY.—Under Suspension of the Rules *Lithostrotion* is hereby standardized, with *Lithostrotion striatum* as type species, and is placed in the Official List of Generic Names.

Presentation of case.—By Dr. W. D. Lang and Dr. S. Smith:

We wish the species *Lithostrotion striatum* to be standardized as the genolectotype of *Lithostrotion*. The history is as follows:

Lithostrotion Fleming, 1828, History of British Animals, p. 508.

GENOSYNTYPES:

L. striatum, 1828, p. 508.

Erasmolithus Madreporites floriformis; Martin, 1809, Petreficata Derbiensia, pl. 43, figs. 3 and 4; pl. 44, fig. 5.

L. obliquim; Fleming, 1828, p. 508.

L. marginatum; Fleming, 1828, p. 508.

In 1845, Lonsdale (in Murchison, Geology of Russia, vol. 1, p. 602) mentions four species of Lithostrotion, namely L. emarciatum, L. mammillare, L. astroides, and L. floriforme. Without definitely designating L. floriforme (the only genosyntype involved) as lectotype, he yet discusses and determines the characters of Lithostrotion upon L. floriforme, clearly implying that he considered L. floriforme as lectotype. But if the author's intention is considered, it might be argued that Fleming intended L. striatum as genotype of Lithostrotion, since he placed it first, and gave it the trivial name striatum which, with the name Lithostrotion, is an echo of Lhwyd's description "Lithostrotion sive Basaltes minus striatum et stellatum," to which Fleming refers in his description of L. striatum.

Since, however, a genolectotype must be deliberately designated ("the meaning of the expression 'select the type' must be rigidly construed"), we are bound to leave both Fleming and Lonsdale with their implied intentions, and pass on to Edwards and Haime, who, in 1851 (Mon. British Fossil Corals, p. 72) deliberately designated L. floriforme Fleming, as genotype of Lithostrotion; and the fact that thereafter both they, and nearly all other authors, abandoned this ruling, interpreting Lithostrotion as if the genolectotype were L. striatum, and including L. floriforme in McCoy's genus Lonsdaleia, does not invalidate Edwards and Haime's prior pronouncement. L. floriforme, then, still stands as the genolectotype of Lithostrotion.

Now the generic type of the coral which, since 1851, has been almost universally, though wrongly, ascribed to Lithostrotion, is very abundant in the Carboniferous Limestone and includes several separable forms. The same is true of the genus Lonsdaleia of which the genolectotype is L. duplicata (Martin) and which includes the species of L. floriformis (Martin), i.e., the Lithostrotion floriforme of Fleming and the true genolectotype of Lithostrotion. It is easily seen, therefore, that much of Carboniferous Coral nomenclature is thrown into confusion by giving the correct interpretation to Lithostrotion; and that time, labor, and misunderstanding would be saved, if the species L. striatum, which the author of Lithostrotion clearly intended as genotype, should be standardized as genolectotype of Lithostrotion.

Discussion.—By Commissioner Bather:

The name *Lithostrotion* in the sense proposed by the writers is so commonly used in textbooks as well as in scientific papers that stability of nomenclature is more likely to be attained by suspending the rules in this instance than by enforcing them. I therefore commend the proposal that *L. striatum* be fixed as genotype of *Lithostrotion* to the favorable consideration of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

The papers in this case have been submitted to Dr. T. Wayland Vaughan, and his reply is appended herewith for the information of the Commission and as a part of the Opinion:

I have received your letter of January 5 and the papers relative to recognition of Lithostrotion striatum as the genolectotype of Lithostrotion. I am not able to check all of the references given by Mr. Lang but I can check his reference to Edwards and Haime's British Fossil Corals. I am convinced that the presentation of Messrs. Lang and Stanley Smith is in all respects correct. Unless there is some urgent reason not known to me I incline to agree with the recommendation of Messrs. Lang, Smith, and Bather. I think that you know the standing of these three men. It is very high and Doctor Bather is one of the most distinguished paleontologists living. If their recommendation is not adopted the name Lithostrotion will have to replace Lonsdaleia McCoy, 1849, which would be unfortunate. I don't like to express a positive opinion until I am entirely sure that I have considered all of the different angles, but I am not inclined to make any opposition to the recommendation you have referred to me.

Notice that this case is under consideration for Suspension has been published as follows:

Monitore Zoologico Italiano, Anno 38, 1927, No. 9.

Nature, vol. 119, June 4, 1927.

Zoologischer Anzeiger, Band 71, Heft 11-12, 28 Mai, 1927.

Science (Query).

The Secretary moves that in accordance with Commissioner Bather's Opinion the Commission adopt the following:

SUMMARY.—Under Suspension of the Rules *Lithostrotion* is hereby standardized, with *Lithostrotion striatum* as type species, and is placed in the Official List of Generic Names.

Opinion concurred in by eleven (11) Commissioners: Apstein, Bather, Chapman, Handlirsch, Horvath, Ishikawa, Jordan (D. S.), Jordan (K.), Stiles, Stone, Warren.

Opinion dissented from by no Commissioner.

Not voting, six (6) Commissioners: Dabbene, Hartert, Kolbe, Loennberg, Neveu-Lemaire, Stejneger.

Motion concurred in by ten (10) Commissioners: Apstein, Bather, Chapman, Dabbene, Horvath, Ishikawa, Jordan (D. S.), Jordan (K.), Stiles, Stone.

Motion dissented from by no Commissioner.

Not voting, six (6) Commissioners: Handlirsch, Hartert, Kolbe, Loennberg, Neveu-Lemaire, Stejneger, Warren.